

#2635

RECEIVED

From: Kaufman, Kim
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2008 9:52 AM
To: Schalles, Scott R.; Wilmarth, Fiona E.; Gelnett, Wanda B.
Cc: Outreach; Johnson, Leslie A. Lewis; Emery, Heather
Subject: FW: IRRC #2635, Gifted Education

2008 SEP 16 AM 10:15

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
REVIEW COMMISSION

Add another one to the pile. "Final Comments"

-----Original Message-----

From: Mrtbadger@aol.com [mailto:Mrtbadger@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2008 9:50 AM
To: Kaufman, Kim
Subject: IRRC #2635, Gifted Education

Dear Chairman Coccodrilli,

My name is Marilyn Thomas and I am the parent of two identified gifted students who attend Hempfield School District in Lancaster County. I have been a member of PAGE (Pennsylvania Association for Gifted Education) since 2004. I am currently the President of the local PAGE affiliate in my area, known as LC PAGE, or the Lancaster County PARTners for Gifted Education. I have held this office for the last 3 years. I am the 2008 recipient of the PAGE "Parent of the Year" award. I have attended numerous local, state, and national conferences on gifted and special education over the last 8 years. I have advocated for better gifted education services for students within my own school district, and for students in Lancaster County, Central PA, and at the state level. I have been a speaker for parent groups throughout the area and at the Annual PAGE Conference. I have also presented at Millersville University's Gifted Institute, a summer graduate course for educators.

I have closely followed the Chap. 16 revision process from the initial stakeholders meeting in December, 2006 to the present. I provided comments at the Harrisburg and Lehigh Valley roundtable meetings in 12/06 & 1/07. I presented oral testimony and sent written comments to the State Board of Education on the proposed changes to Chap. 16 in 2007.

As president of LC PAGE, I receive many phone calls and emails from parents of gifted students in districts throughout south-central PA. These parents have concerns and questions about their school district's gifted education programming. My personal experience in working with parents from so many different districts directly contradicts some of the 9/8/07 comments made by the State Board of Education. This causes me to seriously question the State Board of Education's understanding of the current reality of gifted education programming in Pennsylvania's school districts.

It is my experience that school district staff do NOT have a clear understanding of the term "Present Levels of Educational Performance" or the term "meaningful benefit" as it relates to gifted students. These terms need to be defined. I believe the IRRC should vote to disapprove the Chap. 16 regulations at this time. I have added my name to the list of signatures on Todd McIntyre's Applied Gifted Education 9/9/08 letter to the IRRC.

I also believe the "Screening & Evaluation Process" outlined in section 16.21 of Chap. 16 would benefit from greater clarification. This would improve the identification of giftedness in students who have English as a second language, are from lower socioeconomic groups or culturally diverse backgrounds, or have disabilities which can mask their giftedness. As the mother of a child who is identified as both gifted & learning disabled (also known as a trice exceptional student), I am especially concerned about students like my son who could go unidentified under the current regulations and never receive the services they deserve and need. When my son was in kdg. we had him tested by a private school psychologist who identified him as being both gifted and learning disabled. My experience in dealing with gifted identification issues in many area school districts, leads me to believe there are nuances in reviewing test scores that many school psychologists seem unfamiliar with when it comes to identifying giftedness in the more diverse student populations.

9/16/2008

To directly address this issue, the National Association for Gifted Children recently published a position paper in January, 2008 on the "Use of the WISC-IV for Gifted Identification." This paper describes specific guidelines to be followed when using the WISC-IV for identifying gifted students. (see NAGC Position Paper attached)

I would like to draw your attention to the second page of the paper, about midway down the page to the second indented paragraph:

"The Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI) and the Perceptual Reasoning Index (PRI) are also independently appropriate for selection to programs for the gifted, especially for culturally diverse, bilingual, twice exceptional students or visual-spatial learners."

Much could be done to improve the gifted identification for twice exceptional, culturally diverse, and English as a second language learners by incorporating language into Chapter 16 that would reflect these NAGC recommendations. Specifically, the State Board of Education should consider language in the revised Chap. 16, section 16.21 (e) (5) that a score of 130 or above on either the Verbal Comprehension Index or the Perceptual Reasoning Index of the WISC-IV qualifies a student for gifted identification, when said student has a culturally diverse background, is bilingual, twice exceptional, or is a visual-spatial learner.

The State Board of Education has wisely stated in section 16.21 (d) that "Deficits in memory or processing speed...cannot be the sole basis upon which a student is determined to be ineligible for gifted special education." This language recognizes the need to use the General Ability Index (or GAI) instead of the Full Scale IQ score when using the WISC-IV to identify gifted students where the processing speed and working memory scores may be depressed. It is time to take this language a step further so we can better identify all of our gifted students, including those who are twice exceptional, culturally diverse, ESL learners or visual-spatial learners. Only then can we hope to begin to provide equal access to gifted programming and services for all of our gifted students.

Please disapprove Chap. 16 at this time to allow the State Board of Education an opportunity to address and correct these areas of concern to the regulated community.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Thomas
717-898-7539

Psssst...Have you heard the news? [There's a new fashion blog, plus the latest fall trends and hair styles at StyleList.com.](#)



POSITION PAPER

Use of the WISC-IV for Gifted Identification

School districts use multi-faceted approaches to identify gifted students. Some states and districts employ comprehensive individual IQ tests as one of several identifiers. The most popular of these is the *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fourth Edition* (WISC-IV) (Lubin, Wallis & Paine, 1971). Even in districts where IQ tests are not used in student selection, the WISC-IV is often administered when the parents appeal the decision to deny a child services.

Also, for twice exceptional children, the WISC-IV plays an important role in documenting the child's giftedness and learning deficits, as well as revealing the giftedness of children with expressive, physical, or other disabilities. In prior versions of the Wechsler scales, the child's Full Scale IQ score has been the primary determining factor in placement. However, the Full Scale IQ score of the WISC-IV often does not represent a child's intellectual abilities as well as the General Ability Index. Therefore, some guidelines for test interpretation are necessary.

This position statement is designed for school psychologists, coordinators of gifted programs, teachers, and all professionals who determine placements based on IQ scores or design services based on a child's strengths and weaknesses. It is also provided for parents so they can better understand the interpretation of their children's scores. It is not intended to narrow the choice of tests in the selection of gifted students, but to broaden the guidelines for use of the WISC-IV and prevents its use in a way that is disadvantageous to gifted children.

The WISC-IV was standardized on 2200 children, including Caucasians, African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and others (a combined designation including Native Americans, Alaskan Natives, and other groups in the U.S.), in proportion to their distribution in the American population. Parental educational levels and geographic regions were also proportionately represented. In concert with the publishers' concerns for "Suitability and Fairness," greater flexibility is built into the administration of the WISC-IV: examiners are permitted to use appropriate substitutions of subtests when necessary for equitability (Wechsler, 2003). Nevertheless, IQ tests should be interpreted cautiously for children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, and for all children, and should never be the only basis for exclusion from gifted programs. In addition, all efforts should be made to accommodate linguistic diversity and test children in their native language.

The WISC-IV introduces important structural changes that compromise the relevance of the Full Scale IQ score (FSIQ) for gifted children. The Verbal and Performance IQ scores of earlier versions of the scale have been replaced by four Composite/Index scores on the WISC-IV: Verbal Comprehension, Perceptual Reasoning, Working Memory and Processing Speed. The weight of *processing skills* in the Full Scale IQ calculation has doubled, with a consequent reduction in the weight assigned to *reasoning* tasks (verbal, visual-spatial and mathematical). Testers of the gifted know that abstract reasoning tasks best identify cognitive giftedness, while processing skills measures do not. Gifted children with or without disabilities may be painstaking, reflective and perfectionistic on paper-and-pencil tasks, lowering their Processing Speed Index scores; to a lesser degree, they may struggle when asked to recall non-meaningful material (Digit Span, Letter-Number Sequencing), lowering their Working Memory Index, even though they excel on meaningful auditory memory tasks that pique their interest.

As a result, a majority of gifted children show considerable variability in their Composite/Index scores on the

WISC-IV, a problem less often encountered in average children. When this occurs, WISC-IV Full Scale IQ scores for the gifted may be difficult to interpret and, in some cases, may be lowered sufficiently by processing skills to prevent gifted children from qualifying for needed programs.-

It is recommended practice to derive the General Ability Index (GAI) when there are large disparities among the Composite/Index scores (Flanagan & Kaufman, 2004; Weiss, Saklofske, Prifitera & Holdnack, 2006). Flanagan and Kaufman (2004), in *Essentials of WISC-IV Assessment*, deem the FSIQ “not interpretable” if Composite scores vary by 23 points (1.5 standard deviations) or more. The GAI utilizes only scores from the Verbal Comprehension and Perceptual Reasoning Composites, not Working Memory and Processing Speed. If the Verbal Comprehension and Perceptual Reasoning Composite scores vary by less than 23 points, “the GAI may be calculated and interpreted as a reliable and valid estimate of a child’s global intellectual ability” (p. 128). Use of the GAI takes on special significance with the gifted. Verbal Comprehension and Perceptual Reasoning tasks are heavily loaded on abstract reasoning ability and are better indicators of giftedness than Working Memory (auditory memory that is manipulated) and Processing Speed (speed on paper-and-pencil tasks). Harcourt Assessments, publishers of the WISC-IV, provides GAI tables on its website in support of similar use of the GAI when the variance between Composite scores is both *significant* and *unusual* (see *Technical Report #4*).

In light of these circumstances, where comprehensive testing is available, NAGC recommends that WISC-IV Full Scale IQ scores **not** be required for admission to gifted programs. Instead, the following guidelines are suggested:

When the WISC-IV is used for the identification of gifted students, either the General Ability Index (GAI), which emphasizes reasoning ability, or the Full Scale IQ Score (FSIQ), should be acceptable for selection to gifted programs. The GAI should be derived using the table provided in the Harcourt Assessments website (*Technical Report 4*)
[\[http://harcourtassessments.com/hai/Images/pdf/wisciv/WISCIVTechReport4.pdf\]](http://harcourtassessments.com/hai/Images/pdf/wisciv/WISCIVTechReport4.pdf)

The Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI) and the Perceptual Reasoning Index (PRI) are also independently appropriate for selection to programs for the gifted, especially for culturally diverse, bilingual, twice exceptional students or visual-spatial learners. It is important that a good match be made between the strengths of the child and the attributes of the program. Students who have special learning needs should be admitted to gifted programs, provided that there are other indications of giftedness and instructional modifications are made to fit the needs of the students.

Testers should consider whether flexibility in subtest choice is needed. Up to two substitutions of supplementary subtests for core subtests can be made on the WISC-IV (in different Composite areas), decided a priori. For example, the use of Arithmetic, instead of Digit Span or Letter-Number Sequencing, may improve assessment of Working Memory for gifted children who are not math phobic. Arithmetic substitutes a meaningful memory task for one of the non-meaningful subtests, is heavily weighted for abstract reasoning ability, and can reveal mathematical talent. Substitutions may also be considered for disabilities, such as using Picture Completion instead of Block Design when testing a child with fine motor difficulties.

If these guidelines are followed, the WISC-IV offers an excellent reasoning test with a good balance between verbally administered abstract reasoning and language items and tasks that assess visual-spatial and nonverbal reasoning with visual prompts (minimal verbal explanation). Visual items on the WISC-IV offer reduced timing emphasis over those on the WISC-III, an advantage for reflective gifted children. The entire WISC-IV is a wise choice for the comprehensive assessment of gifted children, when Working Memory and Processing Speed subtests are used diagnostically. Administering just the Verbal Comprehension and Perceptual Reasoning sections (a total of six subtests), and calculating a GAI, is also a justifiable, shorter, and cost-effective alternative for selecting gifted students.

Selected References

- Flanagan, D. P., & Kaufman, A. S. (2004). *Essentials of WISC-IV assessment*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gilman, B. J., & Falk, R. F. (2005, August). *Research-based guidelines for use of the WISC-IV in gifted assessment*. Paper presented at the 16th Biennial Conference of the World Council for Gifted and Talented Children, New Orleans, LA.
- Lubin, B., Wallis, R. R., & Paine, C. (1971). Patterns of psychological test usage in the United States: 1935 – 1969. *Professional Psychology, 2*, 70-74.
- Rimm, S., Gilman, B. J., & Silverman, L. K. (2008). Non-traditional applications of traditional testing. In J. VanTassel-Baska (Ed.), *Critical issues in equity and excellence in gifted education series, Volume 2: Alternative assessment of gifted learners* (pp. 175-202). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Silverman, L. K. (in press). The measurement of giftedness. In L. Shavinina, Ed. *The handbook on giftedness*. New York: Springer Science.
- Wechsler, D. (2003). *The WISC-IV technical and interpretive manual*. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.
- Weiss, L. G., Saklofske, D. H., Prifitera, A., & Holdnack, J. A. (2006). *WISC-IV Advanced clinical interpretation*. Burlington, MA: Academic Press.

Approved 1/08

About NAGC

The National Association for Gifted Children is an organization of parents, educators, other professionals, and community leaders who unite to address the unique needs of all children and youth with demonstrated gifts and talents as well as those who may be able to develop their talent potential with appropriate educational experiences. We support and develop policies and practices that encourage and respond to the diverse expressions of gifts and talents in children and youth from all cultures, racial and ethnic backgrounds, and socioeconomic groups. To this end, NAGC supports and engages in research and development, staff development, advocacy, communication, and collaboration with other organizations and agencies that strive to improve the quality of education for all students.